

knowledge. To say that "gold" belongs to the class "metal" tells us nothing but what we are assumed already to know, and hence syllogistic logic is no explanation of thought at all. Hence the fallacy of the supposed process of abstraction by which class notions are formed; hence the elaborate trifling of the whole doctrine of conversion, opposition, reduction, &c., with its bewildering maze of subtleties, interesting to no living creature but one who can be contented to dwell in the realm

"Where entity and quiddity,
The ghosts of defunct bodies fly."

The fallacy underlying the Aristotelian doctrine of syllogism has its source in the same mistake as caused Plato, in one phase of his ideal theory, to identify the universal with an abstract idea. It is wrongly assumed that the "sensible" is given in an immediate apprehension which is absolutely exclusive of any relation of thought. Real objects, constituted of various properties, are first, it is supposed, revealed as wholes in an immediate presentation of sense; and then thought, of its own arbitrary choice, selects a certain number of those properties and sets them apart for special contemplation. A general conception is thus formed, differing from the individual concretes simply in the absence of certain properties. By successive generalizations we go further and further away from the concrete objects with which we started, until at length we reach the abstraction of "being." In reasoning we reverse the process and descend from the abstract to the concrete. What proceeding could be more superfluous than this monotonous ascent and descent of the same logical tree! Syllogistic logic is necessarily barren of all results. We may go on in this way for ever, combin-